



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/556,092	11/09/2005	Markus Oles	280378US0PCT	4755
22850	7590	04/21/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
LIGHTFOOT, ELENA TSOY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1792				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/21/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/556,092

Applicant(s)

OLES ET AL.

Examiner

Elena Tsoy Lightfoot

Art Unit

1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/88)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :11/9/05, 3/7/06, 3/28/06, 3/20/07, 9/24/08, 12/12/08 .

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-3, in the reply filed on March 9, 2009 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the Office has not considered the relationship of the inventions of Groups I-II with respect to 37 C.F.R. § 1.475(b)(1). Claims 1-3 are drawn to a process, claims 3-5 are drawn to a product. 37 C.F.R. § 1.475(b) states in pertinent part: "An international or a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories: (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product;...".

This is not found persuasive. First of all, in contrast to Applicants statement, the process of claims 1-3 is not specially adapted for the manufacture of the product of claims 3-5 because claims 1-3 do not recite any special process steps for making special product, especially considering the fact that the article of claims 3-5 is of indefinite shape and of indefinite material. Therefore, 37 C.F.R. § 1.475(b)(1) is not pertinent to the Groups I and II.

Second, under PCT Rule 13.2 the groups of claims lack unity if the technical feature shared by the groups does not make a contribution over the prior art. See also form paragraph 18.07.02. Groups I and II lack unity of inventions because even though the inventions of these groups require hydrophobicized microparticles of claim 1, this technical feature shared by the groups is not a special technical feature as **it does not make a contribution over the prior art** in view of Oles et al. (US 20020150723). The shared technical feature lacks novelty because hydrophobicized microparticles of claim 1 are anticipated by Oles et al. Oles et al describes particles having a particle diameter of 0.3-30 microns (See P17) that are hydrophobized with

fluorosilanes such as perfluoroalkylsilanes (See P21). For these reasons the unity does not exist between the groups of claims.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 1-5 are pending in the application. Claims 4-5 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: *fixing* microparticles to a surface either before or after hydrofobizing that is essential for making self-cleaning properties.

5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP §

2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 1 recites the broad recitation **fluorosilanes or fluorosiloxanes**, and the claim also recites **fluoroalkylalkoxysilanes** which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nun et al (US 20020150724).

Nun et al discloses a method for producing surfaces which have self-cleaning properties and a surface structure with elevations which are formed by the microparticles (See P14), the method comprising: hydrophobizing microparticles with fluoroalkylalkoxysilanes such as tridecafluorooctyltriethoxysilane (See P52) to form a surface structure, the surface structure

having elevations with a mean height of e.g. 500 nm and a mean separation of e.g. 1200 nm, the microparticles having a particle diameter of 700 nm (See Fig. 3 and P22).

It is the Examiner's position that the produced surfaces have not only self-cleaning properties but also oleophobic, lipophobic and lactophobic properties, inherently since the surfaces are produced by the process that is substantially identical to that of claimed invention.

As to claim 2, the particles preferably comprise fumed silicas or precipitated silicas (See P24).

As to claim 3, excellent results are produced when used for producing self-cleaning surfaces on planar or nonplanar objects, e.g. greenhouses of glass or Plexiglas® (claimed plastic article) (See P48), umbrellas or shower curtains (claimed plastic article) (See P49).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elena Tsoy Lightfoot whose telephone number is 571-272-1429. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/556,092

Page 6

Art Unit: 1792

Elena Tsoy Lightfoot, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1792

April 17, 2009

/Elena Tsoy Lightfoot/